



WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
1030 15TH STREET, N.W.,
SUITE 400 EAST
WASHINGTON DC 20005-1503

MAILED

SEP 21 2010

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:
Tsuneo Yasuma et al.	:
Application No. 10/558,846	: DECISION ON REQUEST
Filed: November 30, 2005	: FOR RECONSIDERATION
Attorney Docket No. 2007_0365	: OF PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT
	:

This is a decision on the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT filed February 16, 2010 and the SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT filed March 1, 2010, requesting correction of the patent term adjustment indicated on the above-identified patent from 118 days to 261 days. Applicant requests this correction in part on the basis that the Office will take in excess of three years to issue this patent and in light of the recent court decision in *Wyeth v. Kappos*, 2009-1120 (Fed. Cir. 1-7-2010).

As the instant application for patent term adjustment requests reconsideration of the patent term adjustment as it relates to the Office's failure to issue the patent within three years of the filing date, the application for patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.705(b) is **DISMISSED as PREMATURE**.

Knowledge of the actual date the patent issues is required to calculate the amount, if any, of additional patent term patentees are entitled to for Office failure to issue the patent within three years. See 37 CFR 1.702(b). (This is true even where a request for continued examination (RCE) was filed). The computer will not undertake the § 1.702(b) calculation until the actual date of issuance of the patent has been determined. Likewise, the computer will not calculate any further Office delay under 37 CFR 1.702(a)(4) or applicant delay under 37 CFR 1.704(c)(10) until the actual date of issuance of the patent has been determined. As such, the Office cannot make a determination on the patent term adjustment relating to those provisions until the patent has issued.

Requesting reconsideration of the patent term adjustment to be indicated on the patent under 37 CFR 1.705(b) based on the initial determination of patent term adjustment and a projected issuance date of the patent (or even the filing date of the request for

continued examination) is premature. Accordingly, it is appropriate to dismiss such a request as premature.

Rather than file an application for patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.705(b) contesting the 37 CFR 1.702(b) calculation at the time of the mailing of the notice of allowance, applicants are advised that they may wait until the time of the issuance of the patent and file a request for reconsideration of the patent term adjustment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.705(d). As the USPTO does not calculate the amount of time earned pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(b) until the time of the issuance of the patent, the Office will consider any request for reconsideration of the patent term adjustment due to an error in the calculation of 37 CFR 1.702(b) to be timely if the request for reconsideration is filed within two months of the issuance of the patent. However, as to all other bases for contesting the initial determination of patent term adjustment received with the notice of allowance, applicants must timely file an application for patent term adjustment prior to the payment of the issue fee.¹

To the extent that applicant otherwise requests correction of the patent term adjustment at the time of the mailing of the Notice of Allowance, the application for patent term adjustment is **DISMISSED**.

Applicants contest the application(s) of 37 CFR § 1.704(b) to reduce the patent term adjustment by one (1) day in that the Office action response was filed on the first business day after a deadline falling on a weekend or holiday and thus was not late.

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but not found to be persuasive.

Rule 1.704(b) sets forth, in pertinent part:

an applicant shall be deemed to have failed to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude processing or examination of an application for the cumulative total of any periods of time in excess of three months that are taken to reply to any notice or action by the Office making any rejection, objection, argument, or other request, measuring such three-month period from the date the notice or action was mailed or given to the applicant, in which case the period of adjustment set forth in § 1.703 shall be reduced by the number of days, if any, beginning on the day after the date that is three months after the date of mailing or transmission of the Office communication notifying the applicant of the rejection, objection, argument, or other request and ending on the date the reply was filed.

¹For example, if applicants dispute both the calculation of patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1) for Office failure to mail a first Office action or notice of allowance not later than fourteen months after the date on which the application was filed, and under 37 CFR 1.702(b) for Office failure to issue a patent within three years of the actual filing date of the application, then applicants must still timely file an application for patent term adjustment prior to the payment of the issue fee to contest the calculation of Office delay in issuing a first Office action or notice of allowance. See 37 CFR 1.705(b) and 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(3)(B). A dispute as to the calculation of the § 1.702(a)(1) period raised on request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.705(d) will be dismissed as untimely filed.

The period, or shortened statutory period, for reply that is set in the Office action or notice has no effect on the three-month period set forth in this paragraph.

A non-Final Office Action was mailed on February 11, 2008 and the response therefore was due on May 11, 2008. May 11, 2008 was a weekend and thus, the response was received on May 12, 2008 which is three months and one day later. As such, a reduction of one day was assessed. Patentees have argued that this is improper, as May 11, 2008 fell on a weekend. However, Petitioner will note that 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(C)(ii)² does not require that a reply be filed in the Office within its three (3) month grace period, but simply specifies that there is a patent term adjustment reduction if a reply is not filed within this three (3) month period. Therefore, the "carry-over" provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 21(b)³ does not apply to the three (3) month period in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(C)(ii).

Additionally, Applicants dispute the reduction of 85 days of PTA pursuant to 1.704(c)(8) for the filing of a supplemental information disclosure statement on October 2, 2009.

On July 9, 2009 applicants filed a response to the non-final Office action mailed April 9, 2009. Then on October 2, 2009, applicants filed a Supplemental Response.

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but not found to be persuasive. Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.704(c)(8), the submission of a supplemental reply or other paper, other than a supplemental reply or other paper expressly requested by the examiner, after a reply has been filed, is a failure to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution.

In this instance, the filing of the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on October 2, 2009 is considered a failure to engage under 1.704(c)(8). The record does not support a conclusion that the IDS was expressly requested by the examiner and neither did the IDS include a 1.704(d) statement.

In view thereof, it is concluded that the determination of patent term adjustment at the time of the mailing of the Notice of Allowance is 118 days.

The record supports a conclusion that this application is not subject to a terminal disclaimer"

² "With respect to adjustments to patent term made under the authority of paragraph (1)(B), an applicant shall be deemed to have failed to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude processing or examination of an application for the cumulative total of any periods of time in excess of 3 months that are taken to respond to a notice from the Office making any rejection, objection, argument, or other request, measuring such 3-month period from the date the notice was given or mailed to the applicant."

³ "When the day, or the last day, for taking any action or paying any fee in the United States Patent and Trademark Office falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal holiday within the District of Columbia, the action may be taken, or fee paid, on the next succeeding secular or business day."

Receipt of the \$200.00 fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.18(e) is acknowledged. No additional fees are required.

The application is being forwarded to the Office of Data Management for issuance of the patent. The patent term adjustment indicated on the patent (as shown on the Issue Notification mailed about three weeks prior to patent issuance) will include any additional adjustment accrued both for Office delay in issuing the patent more than four months after payment of the issue fee and satisfaction of all outstanding requirements, and for the Office taking in excess of three years to issue the patent (to the extent that the three-year period does not overlap with periods already accorded).

Telephone inquiries specific to this decision should be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Patricia Faison-Ball at (571) 272-3212.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anthony Knight', is positioned above the printed name.

Anthony Knight
Director
Office of Petitions